COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT

QUARTERLY PROGRESS REPORT

Cooperative Agreement Number: *X8-83698001*

Reporting Period: *May 1, 2019 to July 31, 2019 (Year 2, Quarter 4/Final)*

Date Submitted: *August 31, 2019*

Prepared by:
eXtension Foundation
c/o Bryan Cave LLP
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street, Suite 3800
Kansas City, MO 64105-2122

Submitted to:

Ryne Yarger
EPA Project Officer
Yarger.Ryne@epa.gov

Project Narrative Summary

Under EPA cooperative agreement, X8-83698001, eXtension Foundation (eX) has created and implemented an online application process for Pesticide Safety Education Program Coordinators (PSEP) for the Pesticide Safety Education Funds Management Program (PSEFMP) funding opportunity for the second year. Utilizing Survey Monkey Apply, an online application process was created for the 2019 funding year, in order for PSEP coordinators to submit applications, provide review of those applications by the advisory committee, award applications, and provide post award services including ongoing communication with awardees.

Applicants complete a seven (7) section application form:
1. Applicant Eligibility
   a. Land Grant University affiliation
   b. PSEP Coordinator Contact Information
   c. Institutional Information
2. Subaward Work
   a. Goals
   b. Evaluation
3. Licensed Work Product
   a. Deliverable
   b. PSEP Collaboration Potential
4. Budget
   a. Proposed Budget
   b. Budget Justifications
5. Office of Sponsored Programs
   a. Office of Sponsored Programs Contact Information
   b. Audit Information
6. Commitments
   a. Progress Reports
   b. Trainings
   c. Personal Development Opportunities
7. Subaward Agreement

The announcement of this funding opportunity was provided on September 4, 2018 via email to all PSEP coordinators, and Extension directors notifying of the opportunity and outlining the online application process. A funding formula was established utilizing ninety five (95) of the funds for year two and any rollover of un-awarded funds from year one to establish a base amount for each state or territory. Each PSEP was eligible to apply for a base amount of $18,750.00. The remaining five (5) percent was divided proportionally based on the number of certified applicators per state or territory. The number of certified applicators in a state or territory was based on the most recent figures of certified applicators supplied by the EPA.

The online system launched on October 1, 2018 at 8 am EST to receive applications. The deadline for submission will be December 1, 2018 at 8 pm EST.

The application system closed on December 1, 2019, at 8pm EST. PSEPs received timely announcements regarding the funding opportunity and 89.50% (51/57) applied for subawards. This is an increase of 6.50% over the applications received for the 2018 funding. Extension deadlines were allowed for two (2) states based on extenuating circumstances provided by the PSEP coordinator. Extensions were granted to the following:

- Montana
- Oregon

Fifty one (51) applications were received, however only fifty (50) subaward applications were funded. Due to unresponsiveness to additional information requested and multiple follow ups to retrieve this information, South Dakota has forfeited their opportunity to receive funds for the 2019 funding year.

One hundred (100) percent (%) of sub-award funds were distributed to eligible PSEPs within 30 days of the advisory committee decision of approval. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients understand program expectations and compliance requirements. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients' compliance/subaward agreements have been finalized.

Applicants stated…"everything was very simply and easy to understand" and "you could not have made this any easier".

1.   PROJECT PROGRESS

Progress reported in this section will clearly identify <u>only</u> those activities performed during the reporting period that were undertaken with EPA funds, and will relate EPA-funded activities to the objectives and milestones agreed upon in the grant work-plan.

1.1   Status of Activities During the Reporting Period

<u>Completed tasks:</u>

1. eX held online and face to face meetings among grant partners:
    a. One hour meetings occurred the first Thursday of every month with National Pesticide Safety Education Center (NPSEC) to discuss the layout of the application process, application content and proposed acceptable deliverables.

    b. A run through of the new online application site, Survey Monkey Apply, occurred on September 24, 2018 with two PSEP Coordinators who were potential applicants.
        i. Applicants who attended:
            1. Mike Wierda - Utah
            2. Clyde Ogg - Nebraska

2. Subrecipient eligibility established to limit funding to land-grant university extension programs in all 50 states, U.S. territories and the District of Columbia

3. Base amount of funding was established based on three (3) year average, 2013 - 2015, of the number of applicators certified in the applicants jurisdiction:
    a. Ninety five (95) percent (%) of the funds for year two and rollover of un-awarded funds from year one were taken to provide a base amount to all PSEP coordinators in the amount of $18,750.00. The remaining five (5) percentage (%) of the funds were then divided proportionally based on the percentage of the number of certified applicators in each state or territory. The number of certified applicators in a state or territory was based on the most recent figures of certified applicators as supplied by the EPA.

4. eX maintained the online application and reporting system.
    a. Contracted with Survey Monkey Apply to continue to be the host site for the online application process.
    b. Online progress report template was created. Sub-awardees will submit these reports online through Survey Monkey Apply at six months and twelve months. Dates of submission for the progress reports will be, January 31, 2019, July 31, 2019 and January 31, 2020.

5. eX generated and announced funding opportunity and application process.
    a. Announcement was made to all PSEP Coordinators on September 4, 2018 for the 2019 funds.
    b. Announcements were sent via email to all PSEP coordinators, and Extension directors.
    c. Announcements were posted on eXtension Foundation and NPSEC websites.

6. eX offered online trainings for application site (Survey Monkey Apply)
    a. October 1 at 11 am EST and 3 pm EST
    b. October 2 at 3 pm EST
    c. October 3 at 3 pm EST
    d. October 4 at 4 pm EST

7. Subrecipients created applications using a simplified online process (Survey Monkey Apply)
    a. The application system opened on October 1, 2018 at 8 am EST.

8. Subrecipients must comply with all reporting requirements. They are explained online and help is offered for those with questions.

9. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients understand program expectations and compliance requirements.

10. The Compliance Review Committee conducted three rounds of reviews prior to the deadline of December 1, 2018 in order to review any applications that had already been received.
    a. The first round of review occurred on October 22, 2018. The committee reviewed applications from the following states:
        i. Washington
        ii. New Hampshire
    b. The second round of review occurred on November 19, 2018. The committee reviewed applications from the following states:
        i. Florida
        ii. Kansas
        iii. Mississippi
        iv. North Dakota
        v. Tennessee
        vi. Georgia
        vii. Maryland
        viii. Massachusetts
        ix. Minnesota
        x. Nebraska
        xi. Rhode Island
        xii. South Carolina
        xiii. Texas
        xiv. Vermont
        xv. West Virginia
        xvi. Wyoming
11. eX offered training sessions for the 12-month/final progress report submission utilizing Survey Monkey Apply
    a. October 25, 2018 at 3 pm EST
12. A fast and efficient subrecipient award process was utilized to receive and approve applications. This process is outlined below:
    a. Applications were submitted via the online application system Survey Monkey Apply complete with a signed subaward agreement
    b. Advisory Committee reviewed applications for compliance and fundability
    c. If additional information was needed from the applicant, the Project Manager emailed applicant advising of the additional information requested and reopened the application in application site.
    d. If the application was approved, the Project Manager made note of the approval and forwarded to eXtension Foundation CEO for final review and approval.
    e. CEO provided final approval.
    f. Application was then moved to "Awarded" status in Survey Monkey Apply site
    g. Applicant was notified via email that their application had been approved, and email included official award package of official award letter, application and fully executed subaward agreement.

13. eX tracked the movement of each step of the distribution process in multiple spreadsheets based on relevant information. These spreadsheets are posted in Google docs and only administration has access. The sheets were and are used by the Project Manager, Tira Adelman to determine if all time frames are being met. Problems, concerns and issues delaying the process for each subrecipient are noted and resolutions are determined and implemented to increase the efficiency of the process in subsequent years. The spreadsheets utilized are the following:
    a. Subaward Tracking - this sheet was specifically designed for tracking the movement of the subawards from application submission until the award ends at the end of the one year term. Categories in this sheet include: status; project number (SA-2017-xx); PSEP coordinator name; state/territory; institution; project title; topic area; subtopic area; deliverable; amount available (per funding formula); amount requested; date funds disbursed; PSEP coordinator email; PSEP phone number; and no cost extension.
    b. Administrative and Fundability Review Checklist PSEFMP Applications - this sheet was specifically designed for use during the Advisory Committee's review of applications for compliance and fundability. Categories in this sheet include: all 50 states, the territories and the District of Columbia; criteria of the committee's review, for example "Does the deliverable topic and subtopic area match the type of product selected for sharing?"; notes on committee's discussion and decisions on recommendation to approve, disapprove or hold the application.
    c. Program Collaboration - this sheet was specifically designed for use of the Program Review Subcommittee in reviewing subawards for the purpose of potential collaboration among PSEPs. Categories in this sheet include: project number; PSEP coordinator name; state/territory; region; institution; project title; topic area; subtopic area; deliverable; description of deliverable; indicated willingness to work with other PSEPs; PSEP coordinator email; and PSEP coordinator phone number.Additionally this sheet includes pivot tables in order to organize the data into groups for ease of use and understanding of the different projects. The pivot tables are sorted by topic area; deliverable; subtopic area and topic area by region.
14. eX made subaward determinations within 30 days of receiving PSEP applications:
    a. First review round for applications by the advisory committee was October 22, 2018.
    b. Second review round for applications by the advisory committee was November 19, 2018.
    c. Third round for applications by the advisory committee was on December 10,2018.
15. Funding announcements were made to subrecipients in six (6) groups. Announcements were sent via email advising that their application had been approved for funding and the requirements set forth by accepting this funding, i.e. progress reporting every six months. The email included an attachment of the official award letter, application

package and fully executed subaward agreement. The dates of these announcements were as follows:.

    a. Group 1 - WA, and NH

    b. Group 2 - FL, KS, MS, ND, TN, GA, MD, MA, MN, NE, RI, SC, TX, VT, WV and WY

    c. Group 3 - AZ, DE, ID, MO, and NY

    d. Group 4 - AK, AR, CO, ME, NJ, NM, OH, OK and PA

    e. Group 5 - AL, AS, CA, CT, Guam, HA, IL, IA, KY, NV, NC, PR, USVI, UT and VA

    f. Group 6 - LA, MT, and OR

16. PSEPs received timely announcements regarding the funding opportunity and 89.50% applied for subawards. eXtension Foundation's original goal was to have 90% of the PSEPs apply for subawards, so we are just shy of hitting that mark. Based on the increase in numbers from 2018 to 2019, I am confident we will hit that 90% in 2020. Four new states and one territory applied for the funding opportunity this year.

    a. Alaska

    b. Kentucky

    c. New Mexico

    d. Oklahoma

    e. Guam

Two states, the District of Columbia and two territories did not start applications. Those that did not start applications are listed below, and at this time we have no information on why they did not apply.

    f. Indiana

    g. Michigan

    h. Wisconsin

    i. District of Columbia

    j. Micronesia

    k. Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas

17. One hundred (100) percent (%) of sub-awards were distributed to eligible PSEPs within 30 days of advisory committee decision.

18. Subrecipients complied with all reporting requirements. These requirements were explained online in the application site and help was and is available to those with questions. Subrecipients agreed to comply with all reporting requirements within the application. Section 8 of the application was dedicated to commitments of the sub-recipients. In this section subrecipients agreed to submit progress reports every six (6) months, attend a minimum of one (1) hour long training webinars as part of this program for reporting system training and professional development, and to attend one professional development opportunity, for example attend the EPA Pesticide Applicator Certification Training (PACT) meeting.

19. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients understand program expectations and compliance requirements.

20. Ninety eight (98) percent (%) of PSEPs met application requirements and deadlines. Out of the fifty one (51) applications received, two (2) missed the submission deadline and

had to request an extension. The states/territories that requested extension are as follows:
   a. Montana
   b. Oregon
10. One hundred (100) percent (%) of subrecipients' compliance/subaward agreements have been finalized. Subrecipients were required to submit a signed partially executed agreement before submission of the applications. This was to ensure agreement with compliance requirements and eXtension Foundations' terms and conditions in exchange for receiving these funds.
11. A link to a brief survey monkey was sent to subrecipients to determine their satisfaction with the process. Two surveys were sent, one immediately after submission of application, with receipt of application acknowledgement. The second was sent after the last group of applications were approved for funding.
   c. The first survey asked applicants to rate their experience using a five star scale in which 1 star being their experience was terrible and 5 being their experience was excellent. We received no responses to this survey.
   d. The second survey was provided via email to sub-awardees on February 5, 2019. This survey was designed to evaluate and solicit feedback for the entire application process and was designed to take no longer than two (2) minutes to complete. Thirteen (13) sub-awardees responded to the survey. The questions and results of the survey are included below:
      1. Overall, how well does the application site meet your needs?
         a. Extremely well - 69.23%
         b. Very well - 23.08%
         c. Somewhat well - 7.69%
         d. Not so well - 0.0%
         e. Not at all well - 0.0%
      2. How easy was it to find what you were looking for on the application site?
         a. Extremely easy - 46.15%
         b. Very easy - 38.46%
         c. Somewhat easy - 15.38%
         d. Not so easy - 0.0%
         e. Not at all easy -0.0%
      3. Did it take you more or less time than you expected to complete an application?
         a. A lot less time - 38.46%
         b. A little less time - 15.38%
         c. About what I expected - 30.77%
         d. A little more time - 15.38%
         e. A lot more time - 0.0%
      4. What process and/or section created the most delay in submitting your application.

  a. Free form option
    i. "Figuring out how to sign. By the time I do the application and/or reports, my brain has forgotten this instruction. Can a line be added within the application form to tell us there?
    ii. Writing text in small boxes. You can't see what is written.
    iii. Nothing, really.
    iv. Negotiation with the University.
    v. Working within our system.
    vi. Realizing I did not hit the final submit button. Suggest an excel spreadsheet that you can send an email merge to those who have missed a step. Assumed I was fine, when I had not completed the process.
    vii. Waiting on OSP.
    viii. Having SPA office needing to provide information as well.
    ix. The delay of a few days at my end was partly the result of our University's application process. Based on eXtension Foundation's application instructions, which says, "Only one applicant per state or territory will be eligible for funding...", I answered YES to this question on the University's application form: "Does the solicitation contain a limited submission restrictions?" That answer triggered a requirement for a signature from our University's Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research. Waiting for the signature seemed complicated and time-consuming because I didn't know how long I would have to wait. In hindsight, though, getting the signature would have been easier if I had started working on the applications a couple of weeks earlier.
    x. I think the application process delay was caused by my failure to submit a few items.
    xi. Sponsored Programs
    xii. Waiting on our office of sponsored programs.
    xiii. No process or section created a delay. All sections were easy and straightforward.
5. How easy is it to understand the information on the application site?
  a. Extremely easy - 53.85%

      b. Very easy - 38.46%

      c. Somewhat easy - 7.69%

      d. Not so easy - 0.0%

      e. Not at all easy - 0.0%

6. How easy was it to understand the terms of the subaward agreement?

      a. Extremely easy - 23.08%

      b. Very easy - 53.85%

      c. Somewhat easy - 15.38%

      d. Not so easy - 7.69%

      e. Not easy at all - 0.0%

7. Did the application site trainings held prior to the launch of the application site help you in navigating the site?

      a. A great deal - 18.18%

      b. A lot - 36.36%

      c. A moderate amount - 36.36%

      d. A little - 9.09%

      e. Not at all - 0.0%

8. How would you rate your experience using the online application site? (star rating)

      a. Terrible - 0.0%

      b. Just okay - 0.0%

      c. Neutral - 7.69%

      d. Good - 23.08%

      e. Excellent - 69.23%

9. Do you have any other comments or suggestions about how we can improve the application site?

      a. Free form option

          i. No, it works fine.

          ii. None that I can think of.

          iii. No changes needed to the site. Possibly modify emails to specific people when needed instead of the entire group.

          iv. Everything was very simple and easy to understand.

          v. No.

          vi. Keep up the good work!!!

          vii. You could not have made this any easier! Thanks!

12. For the 2018 funds fourteen (14) subrecipients requested and were approved for a No Cost Extension (NCE) in order to finish their program and deliverable. The subrecipients who received a NCE and their new end dates are listed below:

      a. Alabama - June 30, 2019

      b. American Samoa - March 31, 2019

    c. Colorado - March 30, 2019
    d. Connecticut - May 1, 2019
    e. Delaware - April 30, 2019
    f. Massachusetts - June 30, 2019
    g. Montana - March 1, 2019
    h. New Hampshire - February 28, 2019
    i. New Jersey - June 30, 2019
    j. North Carolina - June 30, 2019
    k. Puerto Rico - February 28, 2019
    l. US Virgin Islands - June 30, 2019
    m. Virginia - June 30, 2019
    n. West Virginia - June 1, 2019

13. eX offered online trainings for final progress report submission on Survey Monkey Apply
    a. December 5 at 3 pm EST

14. Subrecipients must comply with all reporting requirements. They are explained online and help is offered for those with questions.
    a. The deadline for submission of the Final Progress Report and required shareable deliverable was January 31, 2019. All subrecipients with the exception of South Dakota and those having received a NCE submitted their final progress reports and deliverable by the deadline.
    b. Final progress reports tracked the progress of the project/program, if the required deliverable was submitted, the final budget numbers and if collaboration between programs occurred.
    c. Collaboration occurred between eleven (11) programs.
        i. Illinois and Mississippi
        ii. Maryland, New Jersey and Iowa
        iii. Ohio and South Carolina
        iv. Oregon and Colorado
        v. Tennessee and Georgia
    d. In the 2019 application, thirty two (32) or sixty for (64) percent (%) of programs indicated they were willing to collaborate with another program. If they did not indicate they were willing to collaborate eX will reach out to them after the Program Review Committee meets to make them aware of identified potential collaborations to see if they are willing to collaborate. Last year for the 2018 funding only nine (9) or twenty (20) percent (%) of programs indicated their willingness to collaborate with another program. This is an increase of forty four (44) percent (%).
    e. Going forward further efforts will be taken in order to track these collaborations and the outcome(s). On the application for 2019 the question was specifically asked, if a coordinator was willing to collaborate and if so, if they had a particular program in mind. By having this as a starting point in the application will better allow us to track, encourage and support these collaborations. Example of the

items we would like to track and questions to be answered by these collaborations
  i. What did they do (activity)?
  ii. Output of that activity?
  iii. Selected outcome(s):
    1. Improved quality
    2. Increased reach to new audiences with additional languages
    3. Increased enrollment(s) by putting information online
    4. Saved time by adopting material from others
    5. Reduced duplication of effort

21. eX offered online trainings for first six month progress report submission utilizing Survey Monkey Apply
  a. March 6, 2019 at 3:00 pm EST
  b. June 26, 2019 at 3:00 pm EST
  c. July 11, 2019 at 11:00 am EST (individual training for Texas)

22. Formal requests for all unused funds have been sent to institutions with remaining balances to receive funds via physical check. All unused funds will be placed into the account and used in the total amount of funding for 2020. Total amount received to date in unused funds: **$54,446.31**
  i. Vermont - $584.00
  ii. Puerto Rico - $4.94
  iii. Mississippi - $1,413.79
  iv. Rhode Island - $3,043.55 (Refund request has been sent but have not yet received funds)
  v. Hawaii - $8,811.03
  vi. Texas - $0.10
  vii. Illinois - $3,000.13
  viii. Nebraska - $10.45
  ix. Oregon - $0.71
  x. Florida - $9,548.99
  xi. Nevada - $61.92
  xii. Louisiana - $2,001.43 (Refund request has been sent but have not yet received funds)
  xiii. Minnesota - $917.17
  xiv. Ohio - $240.34
  xv. New Hampshire - $0.43
  xvi. South Dakota - $15,493.12
  xvii. Connecticut - $8,564.56
  xviii. West Virginia - $702.53
  xix. Massachusetts - $47.12 (Refund request has been sent but have not yet received funds)

    b. Additional amounts may be received from institutions who received a No Cost Extension (NCE) and their final progress report and financials have not been received as of the date of this report.

23. In an effort to have South Dakota apply for funds and to have them submit their final progress report for the 2018 funds, eX discovered that South Dakota was not interested in applying for 2019 funds. Additionally, it was discovered that they did not spend any of their 2018 funds and had not produced a shareable deliverable.

    a. eX Project Manager and COO held a conference call on April 18 with the Extension Director, Karla Trautman after repeated attempts to reach the PI and PSEP Coordinator, Amanda Bachmann went unanswered. eX wants to continue to serve all 50 states and the territories so the conference call was also an effort to establish how eX moves forward in future funding years with South Dakota. The results of the discussion are listed below:

        i. Year 1: Final progress report has now been submitted and eX Project Manager will share the 6-month report and final report with Karla Trautman. They used approximately ½ for salary and benefits, so they will return the remainder of the unused funds for Year 1. The shareable deliverable has not been completed, however Karla plans for the product to be completed but not with PSEFMP funds.

        ii. They will not participate in Year 2 funding as all deadlines have passed and their application was incomplete.

        iii. For Year 3, they will be allowed to apply for funding, but we respectfully ask that another PI be the lead on the PSEFMP.

24. In April, eX Project Manager traveled to Hawaii to meet with strategic grant partners to facilitate and participate in a needs assessment for the South Pacific Islands. The primary goals of this project/meeting were to: (1) Establish a Pacific Islands Collaboration Team (IPM Work Group), (2) conduct a needs assessment and (3) identify needs and priorities for educational materials development. The needs assessment was conducted with educators, regulators, and growers to ensure the broadest perspective was gained.

An additional goal of the project, directed by attendees input in the needs assessment, was to consider the future feasibility of creating a Pacific Islands Pesticide Safety Education Center (PIPSEC) to facilitate efforts of Pacific Island educators to meet the needs of their stakeholders. Such a Center could coordinate a wide variety of pesticide programs such as pesticide safety training, pesticide registrations for minor crops, pesticide impact assessment, compliance assistance education for EPA regulatory pesticide programs (e.g., Worker Protection Standard, Applicator Certification and Training [2016]), data management, and environmental and pesticide use surveys. In addition, the Center could serve as a liaison with all of the U.S. Affiliated Pacific Islands, state lead agencies, EPA Region IX, and other regulatory agencies to find opportunities for future funding and sustainability. By having eX present at this meeting, we were able to establish stronger ties with this community of PSEPs, provide insight into what the

PSEFMP can do to enhance their programs & develop collaboration, and deepen relationships with strategic grant partners.

25. eX met with strategic partners to review progress and make adjustments.
    a. Every Monday morning eX Project Manager attends NPSEC staff meetings in order to review progress for the PSEFMP, solicit feedback and make adjustments as discussed and recommended.
26. eX announced subawards to all PSEP coordinators, Extension Directors, and institutional sponsored program offices on April 22, 2019. The announcement provided information about which states and territories applied for funding, those who did not apply, average indirect cost rates, average application completion time, and a breakdown of the products slated to be produced from these programs for this year of funding.
27. eX held online and/or face-to-face meetings to connect partners, subrecipients and others as needed to share content updated and allow for idea sharing and grant compliance assistance.
28. Program Review Committee will meet to identify potential collaboration between programs.
    a. The meeting is scheduled for August 7, 2019
29. Sub-recipients submitted 6-month progress reports on July 31, 2019.
30. Sub-recipients that received a NCE through June 30,2019 submitted final progress reports on July 31, 2019.

Objective 1: Improving the Application, Subaward Disbursement, Monitoring, and Reporting Processes	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
eX held online and face to face meetings among partners, subrecipients and others to share content	X	X		
Base amount of funding has been established based on three (3) year average, 2013 - 2015, of the number of applicators certified in the applicants jurisdiction	X	X		
eX generated and announced online application and process	X	X		
eX developed and implemented online reporting system	X	X		
eX offers online trainings	X	X		
eX and partners announce subawards	X	X		
Subrecipients sign subaward agreements	X	X		

Subrecipients receive subawards	X	X		
eX creates and announces online support network	X	X		
eX offers online trainings on reporting system	X	X		
eX generates quarterly EPA report	X	X		
eX provides strategic partners with mid-term report	X	X		
eX surveys subrecipients to determine the percentage (%) that understand subaward agreement	X	X		
Subrecipients submit six (6) month reports	X	X		
eX meets with strategic partners to review progress and make adjustments	X	X		
eX provides strategic partners with annual report	X	X		
Subrecipient eligibility will be limited to land-grant university extension programs in all 50 states, the U.S. territories and the District of Columbia	X	X		
Subrecipients will create applications for funding using a simplified online process.	X	X		
Subrecipients must agree to comply with all reporting requirements. These are explained online and help is offered for those with questions.	X	X		
Objective 2: **Professional PSEP education and training delivered nationally**				
Strategic partners review educational materials, conduct online workshops and deliver updates	X	X		
Strategic partners review subrecipients annual reports, applicator evaluations, EPA and industry/research updates to guide annual workshops	X	X		
Strategic partners will provide eX a professional development progress report detailing education successes, needs and a continuous improvement plan	X	X		
Each subrecipient generated a minimum of one education	X	X		

deliverable and shared it with the PSEP network				
Objective 3: Improving the PSEFMP by creating and implementing a system for continuous program and administrative improvement				
eX creates advisory committee	X	X		
Advisory committee reviews strategic partners input and actions to make recommendations	X	X		
Advisory committee contributes input for EPA final report	X	X		
Feedback and review of biannual reporting will be reviewed and appropriate actions/solutions identified by strategic partners and the advisory committee will be executed.	X	X		
Annually, eX will organize and conduct trainings for subrecipients that include feedback information addressing administrative efficiency, and education affectedness.	X	X		
Biannually, eX's advisory committee will make recommendations to improve efficiency and acknowledge operations that are working successfully.	X	X		

1.2   Modifications to the Work-plan and Schedule

1.2.1   Include a description of any <u>modifications to the work-plan</u> that were approved during the reporting period. Also mention in this section modifications to the work-plan that will be proposed in the next reporting period. **If none, please state so**.

There were no modifications to the work-plan and there are none proposed for the next reporting period.

Please note that mentioning a proposed modification or item requiring approval in the quarterly progress report does not satisfy the requirement for submitting a request to EPA. Modifications requiring formal approval include changes to the budget and the approved scope of work. Other items requiring approval, such as selection of grant sites, are identified under the terms and conditions of the cooperative agreement.

1.2.2   Please also explain in this section any <u>delays or other problems</u> (if any) encountered during this reporting period for each activity, and describe the corrective measures that are

planned. Also mention what kind of assistance (such as training or technical support) is needed to address these problems in the future.

If none, please state so.

.

1.2.3 Submit a <u>revised schedule</u> if changes have occurred. **If none, please state so**.

A revised schedule is not needed at this time.

2.   PROJECT FUNDS EXPENDED

Table 1: Costs incurred by task and object class for the year.
Note: This schedule has been adjusted to show cumulative project year costs from 8/1/2018 through 7/31/2019 (12 months). Not all drawdowns have occurred yet. Not all expenses have been posted. One task is assumed.

	Task 1	**Task 2**	**Task 3**	**Task 4**	**Total**
Personnel	87,669.85				
Fringe Benefits	27,810.32				
Travel	0.00				
Supplies	0.00				
Other: **Subawards** **Prior Yr C/F** **Prior Yr Refunds**	 847,860.00 136,122.90 -49,671.86				
Contractual:					

Clerical	7,690.00				
Accounting	5,810.00				
Legal	11,830.00				
Total Direct	1,065.706.12				

Table 2: **Summary of costs incurred for project year.**

Note: This schedule has been adjusted to show cumulative project year costs from 8/1/2018 through 7/31/2019 (12 months). Costs incurred for the most recent quarter are from 5/1/2019 - 7/31/2019.

Also, the current approved budget for the project year has been adjusted to include both the incremental direct costs for project year 2 totaling $988,470 and $257,983 in prior-year unawarded carry-forward used to augment the approved this year's subaward budget. This carry-forward amount is shown on a separate line below.

As is the case in Table 1, not all drawdowns have occurred yet. Not all expenses have been posted. One task is assumed.

Object Class	Current Approved Budget (Yr 2)	Costs Incurred This Quarter	Cumulative Costs Incurred to Date	Total Remaining
Personnel	87,670.00	22,186.74	87,669.85	0.15
Fringe Benefits	27,610.00	6,958.51	27,810.32	-200.32
Travel	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Supplies	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other:				

Subawards	847,860.00	0.00	847,860.00	0.00
Prior Yr C/F	257,983.00	0.00	136,122.90	121,860.10
Prior Yr Refunds	0.00	-28,001.82	-49,671.86	49,671.86
Contractual:				
Clerical	7,690.00	1,885.17	7,540.58	149.42
Accounting	5,810.00	958.77	5,696.83	113.17
Legal	11,830.00	0.00	2,677.50	9,152.50
Total Direct	1,246,453.00	3,987.37	1,065.706.12	180,746.88

3. BUDGET AND OVERALL PROJECT STATUS

Include an estimate of the time and funds needed to complete the activities identified in the approved work-plan, comparing that estimate with the time and funds remaining, and provide an explanation for any changes. If overall, the project is expected to be on target, please state so. For example, individual tasks may be behind schedule, but overall, is the project expected to be completed on time and within budget?

3.1 Subaward Status

3.2 Project Year Budget Outlook

3.3 Overall Project Budget Outlook

With the incorporation of unawarded funds into each following year, and the steady accumulation of prime-awardee costs over the life of the award, we remain hopeful that we will spend almost all funds within the anticipated five-year life of the award. At the same time, we already know that we will need a no-cost extension because the subaward cycle runs later than our prime-award calendar. However, based on the work patterns we are seeing two years into this project, we expect that both this extension and the close-out cycle will be very manageable.